UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,205	11/12/2003	Hyong-uk Choi	Q78412	2939
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 07/30/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			SAMUEL, DEWANDA A	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2416	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/30/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Interview Summary	10/705,205	e]  6,360,743) and and an agreement vention and spection. Also, claim ally delgating the arrow of the could render the substantial vention. Also, which is a substantial vention and spection. Also, claim ally delgating the arrow of the could render the substantial vention. Also, which is a substantial vention and spection. Also, claim ally delgating the vention and spection.				
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	DEWANDA SAMUEL	2416				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):						
(1) <u>DEWANDA SAMUEL</u> .	(3)					
(2) <u>Attorney Bezak</u> .	(4)					
Date of Interview: 21 July 2009.						
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☑ applicant's representative]						
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.					
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1, 7, and 11</u> .						
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Lefkowitz ( US Patent 6,990,343)</u> , <u>Rom ( US Patent 6,360,743) and Backes ( PG PUB 2004/0166870)</u> .						
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.						
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Attorney explained the inventive concept of the invention and specifically pointed out that the access point has the handoff functionalty instead of the mopbile station. Also, claim clarity was advise, the representaive was ask to clear up the language in the claims that is specifically delgating the access point control of the handoff techinque.						
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)						
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTIFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERPREDICTION OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTAN	last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, V	been filed, APP OAYS FROM T WHICHEVER IS	LICANT IS THIS LATER, TO			
/DeWanda Samuel/						